



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MEANING OF PARACHOREGEMA

BY KELLEY REES

Despite the common assumption that dramatic poets at Athens were limited uniformly to three actors for the production of plays, it has been frequently observed that many of the extant dramas require a fourth. The *Choephoroi* demands an extra actor for the part of Pylades,¹ the *Rhesus* for Paris. "Extra" actors are also necessary for the rôles of Molossus in the *Andromache* and Eumelus in the *Alcestis*. In the plays of Aristophanes extra performers are required for Pseudartabas, Herald, and Nicarchus in the *Acharnians*, Triballus in the *Birds*, Lampito in the *Lysistrata*, the two daughters of Trygaeus in the *Peace*, Prytanis and Heraldess in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, and for Pluto and Plathane in the *Frogs*. In addition to these, many other characters are found in the plays which are not specifically provided for either by the choregus or by the state, if we assume that the former furnished only the regular chorus and the latter only three actors: for example, the companions of Hippolytus (*Hipp.* 61–120), the chorus of boys in the *Wasps* (248–316), the Propompi in the *Eumenides* (1010–47), the chorus of shepherds in the *Alexander* of Euripides (cf. schol. Eur. *Hipp.* 58), and mute characters.² All these and other³ characters of a similar nature

¹ The scholiast ad vs. 889 avoids the difficulty by assuming that the same actor played the part both of the evangelus and of Pylades: μετεσκεύασται ὁ ἐξάγγελος εἰς Πυλάδην ἵνα μὴ δ' λέγωσι. So Müller *Eumenides*, p. 130, and Tucker *Choephoroi*, p. 5. But five verses (886–91) would not allow the necessary time for exit and change of dress. This is the prevailing view, I think, and is supported by Müller *Bühnenalt.*, p. 175; Richter *Vertheil. d. Roll.*, pp. 39 ff.; Lachmann *De mensura*, pp. 21 ff.; and by Schneider *Att. Theaterw.*, p. 137. O. F. Hermann *De distrib.*, adn. 48, holds that such a lightning change would not be impossible, but thinks that the employment of an "extra" would be the easier and more natural plan.

² (1) Those who appear as body-guards or attendants, *δορυφορήματα*; (2) "mutes" like Hermes in the *Eumenides*, Bia in the *Prometheus*, and Pylades in several plays, cf. Hermann *De distrib.*, p. 24; (3) persons that took the place, as is generally supposed, of regular characters when the actors of such characters were temporarily required for other speaking parts, e.g. Ismene in *Oed. Col.* 1096–1555; (4) and finally, crowds of people such as the suppliants in *Oedipus Rex* or the Areopagites in the *Eumenides*.

³ Cf. Müller *Bühnenalt.*, pp. 175–80, and Haigh *Attic Theatre*², pp. 264–68.

overstep the three-actor limit. A discrepancy, therefore, exists between the actual demands of the plays and the assumed limitation of actors. How is the conflict to be explained?

When confronted by such a dilemma students of the drama usually take refuge in the convenient term "parachoregema," which is defined by Haigh, for example, as including "all extra performers as distinct from actors and chorus. This word obviously means something which is supplied by the choregus in addition to his ordinary expenditure."¹ The fact that a Greek name can be applied to the phenomenon has here, as in so many other cases, served to shield the explanation from the close scrutiny to which it should have been subjected; for the word *παραχορήγημα* is a late and rare term, the sphere of its application is uncertain, and there is no a priori reason why we should suppose, if its meaning were perfectly clear, that it is correctly applied to the provision made in the fifth century B. C. for actors beyond three, or for such secondary choruses or supernumeraries as the poet might, in writing his play, find it convenient to employ. This word occurs but five times: in the scholia ad *Prom.* 12, *Eum.* 573, *Pax* 114, *Ran.* 205, and in Pollux iv. 109; while the verb *παραχορηγεῖν* occurs but once, in Athenaeus iv. 140e. Let us first examine these passages.

1. Pol. iv. 109: ὁπότε μὴν ἀντὶ τετάρτου ὑποκριτοῦ δέοι τινὰ τῶν χορευτῶν εἰπεῖν ἐν ᾧδῇ, παρασκήνιον καλεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα, ὡς ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι Αἰσχύλου· εἰ δὲ τέταρτος ὑποκριτής τι παραφθέγγαιτο, τοῦτο παραχορήγημα ὀνομάζεται, καὶ πεπράχθαί φασιν αὐτὸ ἐν Μέμνονι Αἰσχύλου.²

2. Schol. *Prom.* 12: ἐν παραχορηγήματι αὐτῷ εἰδωλοποιηθεῖσα Βία.

3. Schol. *Eum.* 573: ἐν παραχορηγήματι αὐτῷ εἰσιν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται μηδαμῶς διαλεγόμενοι.

4. Schol. *Pax* 114: τὰ τοιαῦτα παραχορηγήματα καλοῦσιν, οἷα νῦν τὰ παιδία ποιεῖ καλοῦντα τὸν πατέρα· εἶτα πρὸς οὐδὲν ἔτι τοῖτοις χρῆσται.

5. Schol. *Ran.* 209: ταῦτα καλεῖται παραχορηγήματα (Dind., παραγορήματα MSS), ἐπειδὴ οὐχ ὁρῶνται ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ οἱ βάτραχοι, οὐδὲ ὁ χορός, ἀλλ'

¹ *Attic Theatre*², p. 265.

² So the best MSS; other MSS omit after *πρᾶγμα* the phrase *ὡς ἐν Ἀγα. Αἰσ.* and read *Ἀγαμέμνονι* for *Μέμνονι* at the end. The reading of the inferior MSS was accepted by Lachmann *De mensura*, p. 3, who was first to recognize dittography in the best codices. Cf. Hermann *Opusc.* VII, p. 346, and Fritzsche *Thesmophor.*, p. 251. Schultze *De chori Graecorum tragici habitu externo*, p. 24, retains the reading of the best MSS. See Müller *Bühnenalt.*, p. 175, n. 1, for further discussion of the passage.

ἔσωθεν μιμούνται τοὺς βατράχους· ὁ δὲ ἀληθῶς χορὸς ἐκ τῶν εἰσεβῶν νεκρῶν συνέστηκεν.

The first passage may be simplified to a certain extent if we eliminate from the discussion the references to the *Agamemnon* or *Memnon* of Aeschylus. The *Agamemnon* presents no situation where *παρασκήνιον* as here described might be used. As to the lost *Memnon*, we are quite ignorant of the situation referred to. If, however, we accept Lachmann's reading and omit *ὡς ἐν Ἀγαμέμνονι*, substituting *Ἀγαμέμνονι* for *Μέμνονι*, we must (with C. F. Hermann¹) understand under the title *Agamemnon* the whole trilogy and find in the passage a reference to the situation in *Choeph.* 889, where a fourth person is actually required for the part of Pylades. This is a plausible conjecture, but if we adhere strictly to the MSS it must be affirmed that neither the *Agamemnon* nor the *Memnon* seems to illustrate to us the use of *παρασκήνιον* or *παραχορήγημα* as defined in the passage.² We are thus justified in disregarding the references to these plays. The rest of the passage yields an intelligible meaning. To begin with the last clause, "if a fourth actor should speak anything (τι) in supplement (*παρά*), this was called "parachoregema," i. e., a fourth speaking³ actor was designated by the word parachoregema. The distinction drawn by Pollux between "parascenion" and "parachoregema" causes some difficulty. "Whenever," he adds, "it was necessary for a chorus performer instead of a fourth actor to speak in lyric, this was called 'parascenion,' 'Nebenscene.'" Obviously such a case could happen only in the situation where

¹ *De distrib.*, p. 39; cf. Schneider *Att. Theaterw.*, p. 136: "d. i. in den Choephoren, da im Agamemnon nichts dergleichen gefunden wird, und der Name Agamemnon bisweilen für die ganze Tetralogie gebraucht worden ist." Haigh, p. 264, n. 2, holds that "the reference cannot be to the speech of Pylades in the *Choephori* because the *Choephori* could not be called the *Agamemnon*."

² Verrall *Class. Rev.* IV (1890), pp. 3 ff., has evolved an ingenious theory. On the strength of the Pollux passage he has added to the cast of characters in the *Agamemnon* two new rôles, the Conspirator and Soldier. To the Conspirator are assigned vss. 1522, 1523; to the Soldier 1650-53. These lines were originally in the text, but were thrown out on the ground that they made no sense in the mouths of those characters to whom they were assigned. The verses are in codex Florentinus. The part of the Conspirator fits Pollux' definition of "parascenion." Verrall thus brings the *Agamemnon* into accord with the statement of Pollux.

³ I. e., in dialogue, as contrasted with *εἰπεῖν ἐν ᾧ δῆ*.

three speaking actors are present on the scene at once and something is to be sung behind the scene. The extant dramas offer no such case so far as is discoverable now, and if there really were such situations, a fourth performer would be necessary, so that parascenion would be a special name for a parachoregema under a special condition. Both terms have the common characteristic of being used of a fourth actor; *παρασκήμιον*, a chorus member as a fourth actor sings; *παραχορήγημα*, a fourth actor speaks. Every fourth performer, whether employed for lyrical parts or otherwise, is a parachoregema, but is a parascenion only in the one case when the fourth person has to sing from the back-scene.¹

Pollux thus defines in terms reasonably clear the application of parachoregema, restricting it to a fourth actor. Schol. *Pax* (4 above) also employs the term to designate supernumerary actors. But the word is given a wider application and is used with reference to mute characters in schol. *Prom.* 12 and in schol. *Eum.* 573,² and to a supplementary chorus in schol. *Ran.* 209³ (2, 3, and 5 above).

We thus learn from Pollux and the scholiasts certain applications of the term. The actual meaning of the word they do not define, nor do they state or imply that the choregus had anything

¹ Jebb *Oed. Col.*, p. 8, n. 1, holds that there is no good reason or authority for *παρασκήμιον* being used of a supernumerary actor; for according to the passage under discussion the term was used when a chorus member took the place of a fourth actor. However, if *παραχορήγημα* includes all extras (whether provided by the choregus or otherwise) the extra chorus member used for actor's parts would certainly be comprehended by the term, though the latter had a more specific name in parascenion. The explanation offered by me is essentially the same as that proposed by Richter *Verteil. d. Rollen*, pp. 20 ff., and by Beer *Zahl d. Schausp.*, pp. 12 ff. Müller *Bühnenalt.*, p. 179, finds the peculiarity of parascenion to be in this, that the term includes everything that takes place "in den Seitenflügeln" as distinguished from what goes on in the orchestra or "on the stage." For instance, the chorus of frogs would be a parascenion, in that they are not visible to the spectator.

² The scholiast seems to lay special emphasis on the *μηδαιμοῦ διαλεγόμενοι*, "since they do not speak," they (*Ἀρεοπαγῖται*) are *ἐν παραχορηγήματι*. Apparently he has in mind a period when all mutes were regarded as parachoregemata.

³ It seems unnecessary to assume that this chorus involved an extra expense to the choregus, since it is extremely probable that the same persons who appeared later as the chorus of *Mystae* here sang the frog chorus. Schneider, p. 137, prefers to retain the MS *παραγορήματα* and translates, "Nebenrufe," "unsichbare Stimmen." Dindorf's emendation is now generally accepted. Assuming it to be correct, the conclusion, I think, is obvious that the scholiast regarded the frog chorus as constituting a supplementary chorus.

to do with the matter. The current definition of the word is really an interpretation of modern scholars, designed to explain and justify a preconceived notion that the poet could employ only three actors regularly. In the passages quoted there is no hint, except it be in the composition of the word itself, that the ancients looked upon the parachoregema as an extra duty which devolved upon the choregus. Pollux, who seems to have derived most of his information on scenic matters from Juba,¹ is often a very unsafe guide for the student of the classical drama. His statements about matters theatrical are often applicable only to the post-classical period. So too with the scholiasts to the dramatic poets. Often uninformed as to the conditions of the fifth-century theater, they naturally are prone to interpret the classical dramas in terms strictly applicable only to their own day. We must, therefore, be on our guard against applying to the classical drama at Athens a late term used first and only by the scholiasts and by Pollux.

To summarize the preceding discussion: According to the definition of Pollux and schol. *Pax* 114 "parachoregema" means a fourth actor; according to scholl. *Prom.* 12 and *Eum.* 573, mute characters may be designated by the same term, and by a further extension (schol. *Ran.* 209) supplementary choruses are included. The meaning of the word is nowhere defined; only its application is known. The word itself seems to be of late origin and may have been used with reference to stage conditions in the post-classical period.

What then is the meaning of *παραχορήγημα*? A correct interpretation of the simple word *χορήγημα* will enable us to give a plausible answer to this question. It should first be observed that *χορήγημα* was never used in classical Greek nor is it ever found as a synonym of *χορηγία* in its technical sense of "office of choregus," though etymologically it might have been so used. *χορήγημα* is a word of late development indicating the concrete thing resulting from the action of *χορηγείν* in its derived meaning. Let us then trace briefly the development in meaning of *χορηγείν* (*χορηγία*), starting with the classical period.

¹ Rohde *De Pollucis fontibus*, pp. 36 ff.

In the classical period *χορηγία* meant "the office of the choregus," "the expense of the office;" *χορηγείν*, "to be leader of the chorus," "to defray the expense of the chorus." In the Orators there is a tendency to employ the words in a metaphorical sense as early as Antiphon.¹ In two passages in Demosthenes the original force of the words is no longer felt: xi. 6 (in *Epist. Phil.*): βασιλέα τῶν Περσῶν χρήματα χορηγείν ὑμῖν προτρέφονται, and in a law quoted xviii. 106: ἀπὸ εἴκοσι καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν εἰς τετταράκοντα, ἐπ' ἴσον τῇ χορηγίᾳ χρωμένους. In Aristotle *χορηγείν* means "to furnish" or "to supply" in several passages: *Eth. Nic.* 1101*a* 15 (i. 10. 15): καὶ τοῖς ἐκτὸς ἀγαθοῖς ἱκανῶς κεχορηγημένον; *ibid.*, 1179*a* 11 (x. 8. 11), and 1099*a* 34 (i. 9. 15). *χορηγία* = "that which is provided," "means," "resources;" in a wider sense "anything which the state requires to be furnished:"² *Pol.* 1332*a* 1 (iv [vii]. 13. 2): δέεται γὰρ καὶ χορηγίας τινὸς τὸ ζῆν καλῶς; see also *Pol.* 1325*b* 37 (iv [vii]. 4. 4. 1) and *Eth. Nic.* 1178*a* 2 (x. 8. 4). In *Pol.* 1326*a* 6 the population is regarded as an important part of the state's assets (πολιτικῆς χορηγίας). In late Greek these words mean regularly "to furnish" and "that which is furnished or supplied." Since the fact is familiar to all, a few examples will suffice: *Plut. Moral.* 956*d*: ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς [ὠφέλεια] χορηγίας δέεται καὶ ὑλῆς; *Polyb.* iii. 68. 8: τὸ τῶν Κελτῶν πλῆθος . . . δαψιλῶς μὲν ἐχορήγει τὸ στρατόπεδον τοῖς ἐπιτηδίοις; *Diod.* xx. 37. 2: χορηγήσειν σῖτον καὶ χρήματα; *schol. Nub.* 807: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτοιμός ἐστι μισθοῦ σοι χορηγείν οὗς ἂν θελής; *schol. Ach.* 348: ὅρος χορηγίαν ἔχον πολλῶν ξύλων; *Dittenberger Syl.*³, 552. 72³ (latter half of the second century, B. C.): χορηγήσαι τὸ γινόμενον δαπάνημα.

From these examples it becomes clear that *χορηγείν* meant in late writers, when the choregic system no longer existed, regularly "to supply or furnish;" that the derived meaning, though common enough in the fourth century, probably then was felt to be a figurative use of the word. *χορήγημα* came in when the figurative meaning was practically the only one, except in antiquarian references to

¹ Antiphon *Chor.* 13; Aeschines *Ctesiph.* 240: καὶ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς σεαυτοῦ χορηγεῖς.

² See note in Susemehl-Hicks *Politics*, 1225*a* 14, and 1331*b* 41.

³ See also *Syl.* 418. 77, where the word has the same meaning.

the ancient custom. This is confirmed by the fact noted above that *χορήγημα* does not occur in Greek literature in the technical sense of "choregia." The first and only appearance of the simple uncompounded form of the word, so far as I have been able to discover, is in Plut. *Otho* 9.¹ Here *χορήγημα*, "the thing provided," becomes "the means for providing something." *ἐπιχορήγημα*² occurs but once, in Athenaeus iv. 140c: ἀλλ' ἐπάϊκλα μὲν λέγεται ταῦτα, ὄντα οἶον ἐπιχορηγήματα τοῦ τεταγμένου τοῖς φιδίταις ἀίκλου, i.e., that is called ἐπ-αἴκλου which is, as it were, "an additional supply" (cf. Liddell and Scott). Thus *χορήγημα* in the form *ἐπιχορήγημα* and the simple word in Plutarch means merely "the thing furnished or supplied."³ Formed from *χορηγεῖν* at a late period, it could not have had any other meaning. *χορηγία* had already been instituted for the technical sense and continued to be so used wherever the ancient custom was referred to, and was never confused even in antiquarian notices with *χορήγημα*, which was always restricted to a non-technical sense. Even assuming that *χορήγημα* came in earlier than our evidence would indicate, it is highly improbable that the two words were ever used currently side by side to designate the choregic system, since the distinction was felt so strongly at a late period. *παραχορήγημα* would signify accordingly "that which is furnished in supplement," an extra or additional furnishing."

The verb *παραχορηγεῖν*⁴ bears out the correctness of this interpretation. *παρά* signifying "additional" or "extra" is not uncom-

¹ ἢ Οὐτίλλῳ λαιμαργίας καὶ οἰνοφλυγίας ἢ τρυφῆς καὶ ἀκολασίας Ὄθων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν χορήγημα πορθεμένους.

² Other compound forms do not occur, excepting those cases with *παρ*- already mentioned.

³ According to Stratton *University of Chicago Studies*, II, pp. 115-243, nouns ending in -μα or -αμα derived from verbs commonly denote the result of the action of those verbs. Thus *χορηγεῖν* "to furnish," *χορήγημα*, the concrete result, "the thing furnished."

⁴ Athen. iv. 140 e; ἢ εν ταῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν φιδίταις κομίζουσι, σκευοποιεῖται ἕκ τινων ξύων ὠρισμένων, παραχορηγοῦντος αὐτὰ τοῖς φιδίταις ἐνός τῶν εὐπορούντων, ἔσθ' ὅτε δὲ καὶ πλειόνων. According to Sophocles' *Lexicon* *παραχορηγεῖν* means in this passage, "to furnish over and above," "to furnish in addition." Such must be the sense of *παρά* here, though the whole word in the sense of *παρέχειν* would give an intelligible meaning. The passage would mean then: "the men had flesh of certain animals in addition to a fare such as was given to the boys at the Phiditia." Jebb *Oed. Col.*, p. 8, n. 1 says: "*παραχορήγημα* (from the verb *παραχορηγεῖν*) meant simply something furnished in supplement to the ordinary duties of the choragus," correctly interpreting the force of the preposition at least.

mon, as the following examples will show: Aristoph. *Eccl.* 226, *παροψωνοῦν*, "to buy a dainty in addition to a regular fare" (Aesch. *Ag.* 1447, *παροψώνημα*, "a dainty"); *Vesp.* 1228; *παραπολεῖ βοώμενος*, "you will perish incidentally, etc.;" also 481 *παρεμβαλεῖν* "to throw in, slip in parenthetically;"¹ Aristotle *De part. anim.* 662 a 9 (3. 1. 7); *ἀναγκαῖον παρεισδέχεσθαι τὸ ὑγρὸν ἅμα τῇ τροφῇ*; Lucian *De hist. scr.* 9: *ἡ ἱστορία, εἰ μὲν ἄλλως τὸ τερπνὸν παρεμπορεύσαιτο*, i. e., "if history should give delight besides instruction" (*χρήσιμον*); *Ety. Mag.* 172. 3 *παράχυμα* "an additional pouring in;" Bekker's *Anecdota* 59. 31, *παρασόφισμα* "an additional invention;" Hesychius s. *εἴλιον*, *παράφερνα* "that which a bride brings over and above her contracted dowry." *πάρεργον*, *παρευθήκη*, and *παρεμπόρευμα* (quoted by C. F. Hermann *De distrib.*, adn. 52 after Wytttenbach ad Plut. *Moral.* 151 e) reveal the same force of the preposition.²

The usual interpretation is untenable because certain functions are involved which either do not belong to the choregus, or which constitute a regular part of the "choregia." But first let us state briefly the current theory. Assuming that *χορηγία* includes the ordinary and legal duties of the choregus, such as providing the chorus, mutes,³ victims for sacrifice,⁴ *παραχορήγημα* "that which is furnished in supplement by the choregus" would embrace all those provisions made by the choregus over and above his prescribed duties, "alles was über die gewöhnliche, gesetzliche Leistungen des Choregen hinausgeht, also jede aussergewöhnliche Leistung des Choregen."⁵ Thus a fourth actor would be a "para-

¹ So Theophrastus *Char.* vii (of the loquacious man) *καὶ κατὰ τῶν πληθῶν γε ἅμα διηγούμενος κατηγορίαν παρεμβαλεῖν* "throw in some abuse of the masses too in the course of his narrative" (Jebb). *παρεμβολή* was a "parenthesis" (Walz *Rhet.* viii. 483, 576). See Starkie's *Wasps* ad vs. 481.

² Other examples of this use of *παρά* are found in Soph. *Trach.* 537, Aristoph. *Ran.* 1116; Poll. iv. 109 *παραφθέγγαιτο* "to speak in supplement;" Plut. *Agis* 16; Collitz *Sammlung d. griech. Dialect. Inschr.* 4254; Bréal *Aegypt. Urkunden aus den König. Mus. zu Berlin* 246. 10 and 340. 24.

³ Plut. *Phoc.* 19: *ὁ μὲν τραγῳδὸς εἰσιέναι μέλλων βασιλίδος πρόσωπον, ἥτοι καὶ κεκοσμημένας πολλὰς πολυτελῶς ὁπαδοὺς τὸν χορηγόν*, κ. τ. λ. But see below, p. 395.

⁴ Aristoph. *Pax* 140: *χοῦτω τὸ πρόβατον τῷ χορήγῳ σφίεται*. For a detailed discussion of the duties of the choregus see Müller, pp. 177, 330-34, and Haigh, pp. 86, 87.

⁵ Beer *Zahl d. Schausp.*, p. 12. The same interpretation is offered by Sommerbrodt *Scenica*, p. 172; O. Müller *Rhein. Mus.* V (1837), p. 342; C. F. Hermann *De distrib.*, p. 39; Richter *Vertheil. d. Rollen*, p. 18; Schneider *Att. Theaterw.*, p. 136; Müller

choregema," an extra provision of the choregus. Mutes also, according to the application of the term scholl. *Prom.* 12 and *Eum.* 573, and side-choruses schol. *Ran.* 209, would be "parachoregemata" in that they overstep the ordinary and legal duty of the choregus. Are these applications of the word consistent with our knowledge, drawn from other sources, of what constitutes the legal and regular duty of the choregus?

Unfortunately our evidence on the responsibility of the choregus in matters of detail is fragmentary and not absolutely conclusive. It is certain, however, that the choregus had to provide and maintain the chorus at his own expense. It is but reasonable to suppose that he was also legally bound to provide everything in the nature of a chorus or side-chorus.¹ No extra duty of the choregus prescribed by law could be properly called a parachoregema which, assuming it existed in the classical period, could have been applied only to a voluntary duty, since "choregia" included all of his legal duties. It seems to me improbable that the provision of any extra necessary for the presentation of a play should have been left to the will or generosity of a choregus.²

It is implied in the passage of Plutarch quoted³ above that the choregus was responsible for the provision of mutes. How far we are justified in accepting his anecdote as evidence for the Athenian practice of the fourth century it is difficult to say, for Plutarch cares little for historical accuracy in matters of antiquity when telling a story.⁴ However, if the choregus did furnish the mutes,

Bühnenalt., p. 179. Weismann *Scenische Anweisungen* (Prog. Bamberg, 1895), p. 32, has a different explanation of "parachoregema" which is substantially as follows: When the poet presented his play to the archon he had to specify what extra services of the choregus the play required, if the usual three actors were insufficient. The specification of such a demand would naturally be indicated best in the text at the point where the extra person was needed. The later grammarians were the first to designate these notices previously placed on the margin of the text by earlier grammarians as "parachoregemata," thinking more of the position where they found the notices (παρά "on the side") than with any intention of implying that they were extras furnished by the choregus. Weismann's theory is not received favorably by Holzinger, *Bursian's Jahresb.* CXVI (1903), pp. 276, 277.

¹ So Böckh *Staatshaushalt* I, pp. 601 ff.

² Cf. Müller *Bühnenalt.*, p. 177: "So waren diese für derartige ausserordentliche Erfordernisse lediglich auf die Güte der Choregen angewiesen."

³ Phoc. 19, quoted p. 394, n. 3.

⁴ Flickinger *Plutarch as a Source of Information on the Greek Theater*, Chicago, 1904.

I cannot but think that he was compelled to do so by the archon. In no sense of the word can they be said to constitute an irregular, occasional duty ("aussergewöhnliche Leistung"). They are essential to a full and complete production of almost every extant tragedy or comedy,¹ and this very fact would remove them from the category of "extras." Is it reasonable to suppose, considering the important rôle that mutes take in the presentation of the dramas, that their provision was left wholly undetermined? Would not the fact that all the plays require such persons for one purpose or another make it imperative that someone should be legally forced to provide them? Müller (*Bühnenalt.*, p. 179) correctly observes that mutes do not belong "zu den Parachoregemen, sondern zu den ordentlichen Leistungen der Choregen," but fails apparently to see that this is inconsistent with the scholiasts' application of the word to Bia in the *Prometheus* and to the Areopagites in the *Eumenides*. The conclusion seems obvious that "parachoregema" had no application to mutes in dramatic productions of the classical period at Athens, when mute characters formed just as much a regular duty of the choregus as the furnishing of the chorus, but that at a later period, under a different system and under different conditions, to which the scholiasts evidently refer, a mute was regularly a "parachoregema," an extra.

What about the provision of "extra" actors? I might add at this point that I have endeavored to prove in a study which is soon to appear² that the so-called rule of three actors had no existence in the classical period, but rests upon a misinterpretation of the lexicographers and of Aristotle, and upon a false deduction from the terminology of the period of the guilds; that there was never a fixed limit to the number of actors that might be assigned to the poets, but that it was rather the policy of the state to provide all the actors necessary for a creditable presentation of plays.

¹ Koob *De mutis quae vocantur personis in Graecorum tragoediis*, Halle, 1882. In Sophocles and Euripides mutes average one or two to each play. In Aristophanes it is impossible to say just how many supernumeraries there are. Such plays as *Thesmophoriazusae*, *Lysistrata*, and *Acharnians* probably required dozens. Cf. White "The 'Stage' in Aristophanes," *Harvard Studies* II (1891), pp. 188-92.

² *The Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama*, University of Chicago Press, 1907.

Assuming that this conclusion will be found to be essentially correct, it follows of course that the state¹ furnished freely a fourth, fifth, or sixth actor, or such other persons as were needed. This would have been more natural and a far simpler method than that of the current theory, that the state furnished some of the actors while the choregus furnished others. Either the state furnished all the actors, or the choregus furnished all.

Assuming for the moment that there was a division of responsibility in the matter of actors, that the state furnished only the three and the choregus the rest, I find it difficult to see just why the choregus should voluntarily take a special interest in actors. His duty was primarily with the chorus, for which he not seldom made liberal provision. Liberality in this case occasions no surprise when we remember the rivalry between competing choregi and the special distinction that attended a successful choregus. Many instances are recorded where choregi lavished money upon their choruses through eagerness for victory.² No such motive or incentive existed with reference to "extra" actors. Choregi as a rule could not be relied upon to furnish more of them than the law required. Some were parsimonious and shirked even their prescribed function, as may be inferred from the fact that the archon was empowered to compel them to perform their legal

¹ I follow the opinion of the majority that the state, not the choregus, furnished and paid the actors. The fact that the state assigned actors direct to the poet, not to the choregus, is thought to imply that actors were paid from the state treasury. Cf. Müller *Bühnenalt.*, p. 336: "mit der Ausstattung der Schauspieler dagegen scheint der Chorege nichts zu thun gehabt zu haben." So Wilamowitz *Hermes* XXI (1886), p. 613. Wolf *Proleg. ad Dem. Lept.*, p. 91, favors the other view: nihil enim dubitandum, quin ejusdem, qui choris scaenicis sumptum suggeret commissio totius esset. One of the strongest reasons, as it seems to me, for the view that the state paid the actors is that the treasury was full of money to be devoted to the festivals, while the expense of the choregus for the equipment of the chorus alone was very great and it is hardly to be expected that he should be forced to bear the extra expense. Cf. Böckh *op. cit.* I², pp. 600 ff. For the production of old plays the state seems to have defrayed the expenses, not the choregus. Cf. *IG. II. 971g*, new frag. 339 v. c. (City festival): *παλαῖον δράμα πρῶτον παρεδίδαν οἱ κωμφοδοί*. The plural shows that some other provision than the appointment of the usual choregi was made for old plays. See also *IG. II. 971 d*, Wilhelm *Dram. Urk.*, pp. 23, 27.

² Antiphanes (*Athen.* 103e) speaks of a choregus ruining himself by dressing his chorus in gold. Dem. *Meid.* 61, choregi spent all their money on such competitions; cf. also *Meid.* 16. Of course *dramatic* choregi also would have the same incentive for liberality as those for dithyrambic choruses.

duties.¹ The episode mentioned by Plutarch² (*Phoc.* 19) shows that the attitude of some choregi was to do as little as possible. The inclination on the part of a few choregi to be remiss would make it both advisable and necessary that the duties of the choregus should be specified in minute detail by law, or, what amounts to the same thing, by the archon in charge. Otherwise misunderstandings would be sure to arise. Suppose the choregus for a play similar to the *Acharnians*, which requires at least three extra performers, should refuse to defray the expense of providing these extras, who could force him to do so, to whom would he be responsible, since the provision of extras was outside the sphere of his regular and legal responsibility? The probabilities are: (1) that all actors were furnished by the state; (2) that, in case "extra" actors were provided by the choregus, it would have been prescribed by law, i. e., would be included under the term "choregia."

In view of the different applications of "parachoregema," to (1) extra actors, (2) mutes, (3) side-choruses, the word could not have meant in the classical period an extra provision of the choregus in excess of his legal duty.³ The results of our investigation up to this point have shown us: (1) that *παραχορήγημα*

¹ Xen. *Hiero* ix. 4. On the choregia in general see Reisch's valuable article in the Pauly-Wissowa *Encyclopädie*.

² Whether the story is historically correct or not does not matter, as far as the attitude (not the duties) of the choregus is concerned. The very mention of the affair indicates that such a case was likely to arise. Cf. Plut. *Dem.* 29: ἐδόκει γὰρ ἀνταγωνίζεσθαι τῷ Ἀρχίᾳ τραγῳδίαν ὑποκρινόμενος, εὐμερῶν δὲ καὶ κατέχων τὸ θεᾶτρον ἐνδεία παρασκευῆς καὶ χορηγίας κρατεῖσθαι.

³ The current interpretation involves another difficulty. The question arises: By what persons were the so-called parachoregemata-rôles played? Lachmann *De mensura* held that such parts were carried by members of the acting chorus, but this view was held up to ridicule by Richter *op. cit.*, pp. 20 ff., who would assign them to bonafide professional actors provided by the choregus. K. O. Müller *Litt. Geschich.* II, pp. 146 ff., followed by C. F. Hermann *Berliner Jahrbücher* (1843), Nos. 49-55 was of the opinion that these parts were taken by *überzählige choreuten* which were left after the twelve or fifteen had been taken from the fifty, the regular number supposed to be in the hire of each choregus. On this assumption Hermann denied the application of "parachoregema" to tragedy on the ground that persons furnished from extra chorus members already at the disposal of the choregus could not have been an *extra expense*. Beer *op. cit.*, p. 15, discards the view that they came from *Ueberschüsse* as proposed by Müller and Hermann; for no one holds that a comic chorus ever exceeded twenty-four, the regular acting chorus, and yet in comedy "parachoregemata" are far more numerous than in tragedy. Beer finds Lachmann's theory also untenable, for it takes the

was never used so far as is discoverable in a technical sense with reference either to the choregus or to his office. The truth of this is confirmed by the fact that *παραχορήγημα* is applied by the scholiasts to certain functions which in the classical period belonged to the regular prescribed duties of the choregus ("choregia"); (2) that *παραχορήγημα* is a word of late origin, derived from *χορηγέειν* in its *non-technical derived meaning* of "to furnish or supply," and was thus applicable to stage conditions in the post-classical period.

If we have arrived at the true meaning of the word and have rightly determined the period of its origin and use, we must next consider in what way it came to be applied to the production of plays as indicated by Pollux and the scholiasts.

The number of actors that constituted a regular dramatic company in the period of the *τεχνίται* was three. These guilds (*σύνοδοι τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν*), composed of musical performers as well as actors, were established in many cities in all parts of the Greek world. The most important guild on the mainland of Greece possessed headquarters at Athens (*IG. II 551. 26: τοῖς ἐν Ἀθηναῖς τεχνίταις*), while outside of Greece proper the most significant was probably located at Teos in Asia Minor (*CIG. 3067: τὸν κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον ἐπ' Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου*). The different guilds of *technitai* had practically complete control of all dramatic exhibitions throughout the Greek-speaking world during the period when their order was recognized and sanctioned by the states. Thus it devolved upon them to furnish the performers for festivals, cities, and private celebrations that required dramatic or musical exhibitions. The Soteric games at Delphi, as well as the Delian contests, were supplied by the Athe-

extra actor from the acting chorus; but he thinks that the choregus always had in his employment a few extra chorus performers capable of acting. This does not overcome Hermann's objection that all persons already at the choregus' disposal involve no extra expense, and therefore could not be called "*parachoregemata*." Beer's assignment of actor's parts to chorus members is remarkable in view of the contention of Bergk and others that poets were allowed only three actors owing to the lack of competent actors for minor rôles. Besides the Pollux passage seems to imply that a *choreutes* was used for a fourth actor only when there were lyrical parts. It seems probable then that the choregus had to hire extra actors of professional standing, and the very fact that professionals were used indicates that the state supplied them, if the state provided actors at all.

nian guild, as the names of performers contained in the records of these contests show.¹ The same guild no doubt sent troupes to all parts of Greece to fulfil contracts, and the synod of Teos sent out companies to the remotest cities of Asia Minor and to Greece. Owing to the commercial and economic basis upon which the guilds were managed, as well as the matter of convenience, there grew up the custom of restricting the number of actors in a traveling company to three, the fewest possible number with which a play might be produced. It is to be regretted that the documents which might have contained the contracts made by the guilds with the festivals or cities for dramatic exhibitions are not preserved. However, it is but reasonable to suppose that when a guild entered into negotiation with the manager of a festival for dramatic contests, everything, especially "extras," were specified in the contract. To use a hypothetical case, the synod at Athens agrees to furnish (χορηγεῖν) the people of Megalopolis with the usual troupe of three actors, a flute player (αὐλητής), and possibly a chorus for a certain specified sum, but if the people desire a fourth actor (as would be necessary for the *Oedipus Coloneus*), or a certain number of mutes (as for the *Orestes*), or a supplementary chorus, the guild will supply these extras (παραχορηγεῖν) for a certain additional sum. παραχορήγημα was thus "an additional supplying," "an extra expense," and was applied to "extra" actors, supplementary choruses, and to *all extras* that might be desired in addition to the *regular traveling troupe*.

ADELPHI COLLEGE, BROOKLYN

¹ Capps *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* XXXI (1900), p. 119.